

**To:** Alex Ruppenthal[aruppenthal@wttw.com]  
**From:** Singer, Joshua  
**Sent:** Thur 3/2/2017 11:16:19 PM  
**Subject:** RE: Yesterday's meeting / new SH Bell questions

Alex,

Please see the response below and attribute to U.S. EPA. Thank you.

EPA staff was on-site at S.H. Bell's Chicago facility the morning of March 1, and has confirmed that the company's air monitoring system is installed and operational. S.H. Bell is subject to other ongoing obligations set forth in the 12/5/16 "Stipulated Settlement and Final Consent Order," including continued operation and maintenance of the monitors. EPA will continue to oversee and assess compliance with these provisions.

EPA began investigating fugitive dust and manganese issues at S.H. Bell's Chicago facility in April 2014 as part of a larger effort that included close coordination with the City of Chicago Department of Public Health and the Illinois EPA to identify and address compliance issues in southeast Chicago. Due to EPA's efforts, S.H. Bell has installed new air pollution control equipment, implemented an enhanced fugitive dust plan, and has now installed air quality monitors to measure PM10 and manganese. EPA will be closely analyzing the data generated by these monitors to assess whether the facility is causing a threat to public health and to ensure compliance with the Clean Air Act.

S.H. Bell's Chicago facility is smaller than its Ohio facility and processes less material. Also, the levels of manganese identified by the monitors previously (at KCBX) and currently (at George Washington High School) located in the Southeast Chicago community show much lower levels than the levels recorded near S.H. Bell's Ohio facility. An in-depth review of the data generated by the new monitors will be necessary before any conclusions can be reached about the potential of any public health threats.

**From:** Alex Ruppenthal [mailto:aruppenthal@wttw.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 02, 2017 4:12 PM  
**To:** Singer, Joshua <Singer.Joshua@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Yesterday's meeting / new SH Bell questions

Hi Josh,

Just wanted to check in on my inquiry from yesterday.

Through S.H. Bell and city officials, we were able to confirm that the company met the EPA's deadline for installing air monitors. But I would still appreciate responses to the first two questions sent yesterday.

Thanks for your help.

Best,

Alex

**From:** Singer, Joshua [<mailto:Singer.Joshua@epa.gov>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 01, 2017 1:55 PM  
**To:** Alex Ruppenthal  
**Subject:** RE: Yesterday's meeting / new SH Bell questions

Alex,

Thank you for the email.

Is it possible to extend your deadline?

Thanks again.

Josh Singer

U.S. EPA, Region 5

phone: 312-353-5069

[singer.joshua@epa.gov](mailto:singer.joshua@epa.gov)

**From:** Alex Ruppenthal [<mailto:aruppenthal@wttw.com>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, March 01, 2017 11:13 AM

**To:** Singer, Joshua <[Singer.Joshua@epa.gov](mailto:Singer.Joshua@epa.gov)>

**Subject:** Yesterday's meeting / new SH Bell questions

Hi Josh,

It was nice meeting you and Rachel yesterday. Who knew I'd be meeting with two state champions?! Thanks again for taking the time to meet.

We're preparing to publish another story in our series examining manganese pollution on Chicago's Southeast Side, and I have a few additional questions for you.

- In April 2008, then Ohio EPA Director Chris Korleski published findings from S.H. Bell Company's facility in East Liverpool, Ohio, where the U.S. EPA and Ohio EPA found ambient air concentrations of manganese up to 34 times the reference concentration level set by the EPA. The Ohio EPA wrote that the recorded manganese concentrations were "unacceptable for protecting public health," and the findings prompted a series of EPA regulatory enforcement actions and changes by S.H. Bell over the following years (Here is the document with the findings, just FYI:

[http://www.epa.ohio.gov/portals/27/enforcement/year\\_2008/shbell\\_041408.pdf](http://www.epa.ohio.gov/portals/27/enforcement/year_2008/shbell_041408.pdf)).

My question: Did the EPA notify the Chicago Department of Public Health about the manganese-related findings at S.H. Bell's Ohio facility after the 2008 findings? If so, when, how and to

whom did EPA provide notice? Given that S.H. Bell handles similar materials in Chicago, it would seem reasonable that the city would have been alerted about this potential threat to public health.

- As a follow-up, I'm curious if the EPA has a process for "spreading the word" when it obtains information like the 2008 findings at S.H. Bell in Ohio ... that is, would it have been within the agency's standard operating procedures to provide notice about the manganese-related findings at S.H. Bell Ohio to agencies/municipalities/etc. in other locations where S.H. Bell operates?

- As you know, today marks the EPA's March 1 deadline for S.H. Bell to install and operate four particulate matter monitors and a one filter-based monitor at the company's Chicago facility. Have the monitors been installed, and are they operational? If the answer is not yet clear, when does the EPA plan to inspect the facility to determine if the monitors have been installed and are operational?

My deadline is mid to late-afternoon today. As always, feel free to give me a call if you need clarification on any of the questions.

Thanks again for all your help.

Best,

Alex

---

Alex Ruppenthal | Digital Reporter, *Chicago Tonight*

[wttw](#)

5400 N St Louis Ave | Chicago IL 60625

t: 773.509.5623

e: [aruppenthal@wttw.com](mailto:aruppenthal@wttw.com)

[Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#)